



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 7, 2000

No. 103

## Senate

The Senate met at 9:32 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Today's prayer will be offered by our guest Chaplain, the Very Reverend Nathan Baxter, Dean, Washington National Cathedral, Washington, DC.

We are very pleased to have you with us.

### PRAYER

The guest Chaplain, the Very Reverend Nathan Baxter, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray: Almighty, holy, and gracious God, we know You by many names, but we are joined together in this moment of prayer because we know You as the author of liberty. We thank You for the gift of democracy. Although it is sometimes cumbersome, it is truly inspired, and we thank You. Most of all, gracious God, we thank You for the Members of our United States Senate and their staffs who devote themselves to the hard and essential work of Government. Momentous for the people of this Nation are the decisions before them in this session. We ask You to give them courage to act rightly when partisan passions beckon; give them patience and discerning answers when truth is not clear; and give them faith to trust You as more than their judge but their loving Father. Now help us, Lord, as citizens of this Nation, to hold our leaders, their staffs, their work, and their families prayerfully in our hearts that they may be sustained and protected. And finally, ever keep before them and us the guiding light of Your divine vision of one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all. Amen.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable PAT ROBERTS, a Senator from the State of Kansas, led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Repub-

lic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBERTS). The distinguished Senator from Missouri is recognized.

### SCHEDULE

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, today the Senate will have 10 minutes for final remarks on the Daschle motion regarding the Missouri River, with a vote to occur at approximately 9:40 a.m. Immediately following that vote, there will be a vote on the motion to proceed to H.R. 4444, the China PNTR legislation.

Following these votes, the Senate is expected to begin consideration of the China trade legislation with amendments in order. The Senate will also continue debate on the energy and water appropriations bill during this evening's session. It is hoped that action on this important spending bill can be completed as early as tonight. Therefore, Senators may expect votes throughout the day and into the evening.

I thank my colleagues for their attention.

### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

### ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of H.R. 4733, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4733) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fis-

cal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Domenici amendment No. 4032, to strike certain environment related provisions.

Schumer/Collins amendment No. 4033, to establish a Presidential Energy Commission to explore long- and short-term responses to domestic energy shortages in supply and severe spikes in energy prices.

Daschle (for Baucus) amendment No. 4081, to strike certain provisions relating to revision of the Missouri River Master Water Control Manual.

AMENDMENT NO. 4081

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of the Daschle amendment No. 4081 on which there shall be 10 minutes of debate equally divided.

The distinguished Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I may use part of my leader time if my comments go over the 5 minutes. I ask that that be recognized should it be required.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, we are about to vote on an amendment that is critical not only for an important region of our country, the upper Midwest, but really the whole country. How we decide the process by which we make critical decisions about the ecological and environmental balance that must be taken into account as we consider all of the challenges we face with regard to proper management is really what is at stake here.

The Missouri River is one of the most important rivers of the country, but this could apply to the Mississippi River and to any one of a number of rivers throughout the country. Ultimately, it will be applied. You could say this is a very important precedent. A process has been created, enacted by this Congress, that allows very careful consideration of all the different factors that must be applied as we make

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S8129

decisions with regard to management of a river, of wetlands, of anything else.

Basically what this amendment does is simply say, let that process go forward, without making any conclusion about what ultimately that process will lead to. If we ultimately decide that whatever process produced is wrong, we, as a Congress, have the opportunity to stop it. Why would we stop it midway? Why would we say today that we don't want that process to continue; we don't want it to reach its inevitable end with a product that we could look at for comment? That is the first point: a process is in place. The legislation currently within the energy and water bill stops that in its tracks.

I don't have it in front of me, but the report language makes it very clear. Senator BOND and others may argue that, no, this process can continue, but the effect of this amendment stops it in its tracks. We will not have an opportunity to carefully consider all of the recommendations given the language that is currently incorporated in the bill. We must not stop a process that allows us a result upon which we will then pass judgment.

The Missouri River is a very critical river. It is a multifaceted river that requires balance. The current management plan was written when the Presiding Officer and I, Senator BOND, and others were, at best, in our teens, if not in our early years of life. It was written in the 1950s and adopted in about 1960. It has been the plan for 40 years.

What the Corps of Engineers is now saying, what Fish and Wildlife is now saying is that after 40 years, prior to the time the dams were constructed, it is time to renew that manual; let's find another; let's take another look at it to determine whether or not what worked in the 1950s and 1960s is something that will work today. Their feeling is that it will not, that we need to upgrade it; we need to refresh it; we need to renew it.

Back when that manual was written, the anticipated amount of barge traffic was about 12 million tons. We never reached 12 million tons. We are down to about 1.5 million tons of barge traffic, totaling about \$7 million.

We are spending \$8 million in barge subsidies to support a \$7 million industry. At the same time, we have an \$85 million recreation industry. We have an incredible \$667 billion hydropower industry. We have industries that are held captive, in large measure, because of a manual written in 1960 that anticipated barge traffic that never developed.

It is time to get real. It is time to allow the process to go forward. It is time to allow those agencies of the Federal Government, whose responsibility it is to manage this river, to do it without intervention. There will be plenty of time for us to take issue, to differ, to ultimately come to some other conclusion if that happens. But

that is not now, especially given the recognition that the manual is out of date. The manual didn't produce the kind of result over four decades that was anticipated. Now it is time to change. That is all we are asking.

Let the process go forward. The President has said that unless this change is made, this bill will be vetoed. We are nearing the end of the session. If we want to guarantee that this is going to be wrapped up in an omnibus bill with absolutely no real opportunity for the Senate to have its voice heard, then the time to change it, so it can be signed, is now—not 4 weeks from now. I am very hopeful my colleagues will understand the importance of this question, the importance of this amendment. I am hopeful that, on a bipartisan basis, we can say let us allow the Corps, Fish and Wildlife, and the biological experts to do their work. Then let us look at that work and make our evaluation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I yield myself 4 minutes and ask that I be advised when that is up so I may yield to my colleagues.

We have had a lot of argument about whether we ought to stop the process. That is not what is at issue. What is at issue is stopping flooding in downstream States, such as Missouri, Kansas, Iowa, Nebraska, and States down the Mississippi, and the implementation of a risky scheme. Section 103—and I am happy to show it to my colleagues—says none of the funds made available may be used to revise the manual to provide for an increase in the springtime water release during spring heavy rainfall and snowmelt in States that have rivers draining into the Missouri River below the Gavins Point Dam.

This same provision has been included in four previous energy and water bills in the last 5 years. It has been passed by this Congress and signed by the President. It clearly permits a review of alternatives to change river management. It only prevents one, single, specific harmful alternative of a controlled flood, which was proposed first in 1993, subjected to public review and comment by this Congress, and rejected by the administration when it was considered in 1994. The U.S. Department of Agriculture opposed it. The U.S. Department of Transportation opposed it. There was unanimous opinion on people who lived in and worked along the river. The officials there oppose this risky scheme. Now, 5 years later, the Fish and Wildlife Service wrote a letter on July 12 demanding that, as an interim step, a spring pulse come down the Missouri River starting in 2001.

This is supposed to help the habitat of the pallid sturgeon. But what it does is increase the spring rise, and the Missouri and Mississippi already have a

spring rise. We get floods and we have damage that hurts land and facilities and kills people.

The people of Los Alamos know what happens when the Federal Government gave them a controlled burn. They are still wiping soot out of their hair. This is a proposal to give a controlled flood to areas where there is great risk. That is why the Democratic Governor of Missouri, the mayor of Kansas City, both Democrats, both oppose the motion to strike. They support section 103. We know it would curtail transportation, the most efficient and effective and environmentally friendly form of transportation of agricultural goods, and that is barge traffic. It would end barge traffic on the Missouri River, which I think may be the objective. Barge traffic not only gets product down the river to the world markets, but it keeps the cost of shipping under control by competition. It would harm transportation on the Mississippi River. That is why the Southern Governors' Association and waterways groups have come out in strong support of section 103.

Our State Department and Natural Resources Conservation Department oppose this risky scheme. They are dedicated to the recovery of the species. They have other alternatives that need to be and can be studied. The U.S. Geological Survey Environmental Research Center is looking at what we can do to increase the number of pallid sturgeon, and the likely objectives they have do not involve increasing floods in the spring.

Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to join me in rejecting this motion to strike because it puts lives at risk; it ends transportation for farmers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. BOND. I yield that time to my colleague, the junior Senator from Missouri, Mr. ASHCROFT.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I thank the senior Senator from Missouri for taking point on this very important measure that will protect a livelihood and a set of very essential opportunities that exist in downstream States. To send a surge of water downstream in the spring, when we are already at risk of flooding, could hurt the capacity of our farmers to produce. And then to compound the injury and add the insult of making the shipping of what they produce difficult, or impossible, or not competitive, would be very damaging.

Over half of the people in my State of Missouri drink water from the Missouri River. We have come to rely on it as a resource. This doesn't detract from the overall ability to measure and evaluate what happens on the river. It simply says that prior to the plan we are not going to authorize a spring surge which would add flooding and jeopardize the livelihood of many individuals in Missouri and other States that border the Missouri River.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

The minority leader is recognized.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I will use some leader time. I understand I have 8 minutes remaining. My colleagues can vote any way they wish, based upon the facts as presented. Let nobody be misled. This has nothing to do with flooding—nothing. This doesn't apply when there is flooding or when there are droughts. That is written right into the language of this new master manual proposal. It has nothing to do with flooding. This has to do with barge traffic. That is what this is about. It is about barge traffic.

Now, the Senator from Missouri talks about the importance of competition. How much competition is there when you have three-tenths of 1 percent of all agricultural transportation related to barge traffic and 99 percent is rail and highway? Is that competition? My colleagues are appropriately trying to defend a dying industry in Missouri, and they are using flood concerns to protect them. This is not about floods. This is about protecting three-tenths of 1 percent of all transportation for agriculture in the entire region. That is what this is about. Nothing more and nothing less.

I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I reemphasize the first point made by my friend from South Dakota. He is entirely accurate. We hear about the specter of floods. If you look at the facts, this amendment has nothing to do with floods. Why do I say that? It is because of the Army Corps of Engineers' own analysis. Looking at the alternatives, the current master manual, compared with the spring rise/split season, there is no statistical, no difference—it is 1 percent—in the flood control benefits between the two alternatives. None. One percent is statistically insignificant.

So you hear on the floor those protecting a dying industry using another scare tactic, and that is floods. That is totally inaccurate. In addition, the proposal of the spring rise/split season will be used in only 1 out of every 3 years. And the proposal also provides that if it looks as if there might be a wet year, or more precipitation in the year a spring rise might otherwise occur, there would be no spring rise. Why? Because the primary goal of the Corps of Engineers is flood protection. Let's take that off the table; take flooding and the wall of water down the river off the table.

In the 1993 and 1997 flood years, if this proposal had been in effect, there would be no spring rise and no split season. It would not exacerbate the 1993 and 1997 floods.

In addition, if this amendment to strike 103 is not adopted, we will have a big lawsuit on our hands. Why? Because the environmentalists will file a lawsuit against the Army Corps of Engineers because of not protecting the Endangered Species Act. We would have a whole set of problems on our

hands. Let's not have a lawsuit. Let's not have scare tactics for the sake of trying to protect a dying industry that need not be subsidized as it is now.

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I rise today to speak in strong support of my colleague from Missouri, Mr. BOND.

The Bond provision of the fiscal year 2001 Energy and Water Appropriations bill would prohibit the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers from implementing the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service plan to increase spring time releases of water from Missouri River dams to simulate the natural "rise" and "fall" in the Missouri River. This could be potentially devastating to Nebraska's farmers and ranchers and those whose livelihood depends on the Missouri River because the "rise" increases flood risk, and the "fall" interferes with barge traffic.

This "spring rise" that increases flood risks down the Missouri and the Mississippi is particularly irresponsible when you take into account that over the last two years, FEMA has spent \$32.6 million in flood disaster for the Missouri River.

During the flood of 1993, the largest in recorded history, flood costs ranged between \$12 and \$16 billion. More importantly, main stem Missouri River Dams—the very ones Fish and Wildlife want to change—prevented \$4 billion in damages.

If the amendment to strike the Bond provision from the Energy and Water Appropriations bill is successful, and this "fall" occurs, then there is a real potential that water levels are reduced to a point where barge traffic can't get through. Barge traffic is necessary to the farmer. It brings fertilizer up in the spring and brings the harvest to market in the fall. Senator BOND's amendment will ensure that water levels are kept at a navigable level.

This provision is not new to the Energy and Water Appropriations bill. It has been included in four previous appropriations measures that were signed into law by President Clinton. Now, President Clinton is threatening to veto this bill if it contains the Bond provision.

I urge my colleagues to keep the Bond provision in this appropriations bill and keep the Missouri River at a reasonable and steady level.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNNING). The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes to respond to comments made by the distinguished minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I thank the leader.

I just have to say when the point was made that this is not about flooding, that is what has people in Missouri scared to death. Floods don't happen every year. But when the floods happen, they are devastating.

That is why I want to read from a letter by the Democratic Governor,

Mel Carnahan, of Missouri. In an August 17 letter he wrote to the White House trying to stop it, he said that absent change in the service as planned, it is likely efforts to restore endangered species along the river will be damaged and an increase in the risk of flooding river communities and agricultural land will occur; and, States along the river will suffer serious economic damage to their river-based transportation and agricultural industries.

When the Southern Governors Association wrote to the minority and majority leaders, Mike Huckabee, Governor of Arkansas, speaking for the southern Governors, said that if the current plan is implemented and these States incur significantly heavy rains during the rise, there is a real risk that farms and communities along the lower Missouri River will suffer serious flooding.

Frankly, nobody can tell when the heavy rains are coming. I have watched the National Weather Service. They do not know. They cannot predict the heavy rains and floods that have devastated our lands and killed people in recent years. They have come without warning. It takes 11 days for water to get from Gavins Point to St. Louis. They are not good enough. None of us is good enough to know when those heavy rains will occur.

I yield the floor. I thank my colleague from South Dakota.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I know I have a couple of minutes remaining in leader time. Let me respond. I understand it is 5 minutes. I will not use all of it because I know we are about ready to go to a vote.

Let me just say that the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri knows what I know and what everyone should know prior to the time they are called upon to vote.

First of all, it is not a plan until it is adopted as a plan. But the Bond language would stop the plan from even going forward before we have had a chance to analyze what effect it would have on floods. But the proposal, which is all it is at this point, says we will exempt those years when there is a prospect for flooding. We will exempt the master manual from being utilized and implemented if a flood is imminent. We lop off the flooded years and the drought years. This plan is to be used only in those times when there is normal rain flow. That is really what we are talking about here.

But I go back to the point: Why stop this process from going forward before we know all the facts? Why stick our head in the sand before we really have the biological, ecological, and all of the managerial details?

That is what the language does. That isn't the way we ought to proceed. There will be time for us to oppose, if that may be the case. But not now, not halfway through the process. Let's allow this process to continue.

I yield the floor and the remainder of my time.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceed to call the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI) is necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 232 Leg.]

#### YEAS—45

Baucus	Edwards	Levin
Bayh	Feingold	Mikulski
Biden	Feinstein	Miller
Bingaman	Graham	Moynihan
Boxer	Harkin	Murray
Breaux	Hollings	Reed
Bryan	Inouye	Reid
Byrd	Johnson	Robb
Chafee, L.	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Cleland	Kerrey	Roth
Conrad	Kerry	Sarbanes
Daschle	Kohl	Schumer
Dodd	Landrieu	Torricelli
Dorgan	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Durbin	Leahy	Wyden

#### NAYS—52

Abraham	Gorton	McConnell
Allard	Gramm	Nickles
Ashcroft	Grams	Roberts
Bennett	Grassley	Santorum
Bond	Gregg	Sessions
Brownback	Hagel	Shelby
Bunning	Hatch	Smith (NH)
Burns	Helms	Smith (OR)
Campbell	Hutchinson	Snowe
Cochran	Hutchison	Specter
Collins	Inhofe	Stevens
Craig	Jeffords	Thomas
Crapo	Kyl	Thompson
DeWine	Lincoln	Thurmond
Domenici	Lott	Voinovich
Enzi	Lugar	Warner
Fitzgerald	Mack	
Frist	McCain	

#### NOT VOTING—3

Akaka	Lieberman	Murkowski
-------	-----------	-----------

The amendment (No. 4081) was rejected.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. GORTON. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

#### TO AUTHORIZE EXTENSION OF NONDISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT TO THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA—MOTION TO PROCEED—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now vote on the motion to proceed to the consideration of H.R. 4444, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A motion to proceed to the bill (H.R. 4444) to authorize extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to the People's Republic of China, and to establish a framework for relations be-

tween the United States and the People's Republic of China.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to proceed.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, what is the business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion under consideration is the motion to proceed to H.R. 4444 which the clerk has already reported, and the yeas and nays have been requested.

Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI) is necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 92, nays 5, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 233 Leg.]

#### YEAS—92

Abraham	Feinstein	McCain
Allard	Fitzgerald	McConnell
Ashcroft	Frist	Mikulski
Baucus	Gorton	Miller
Bayh	Graham	Moynihan
Bennett	Gramm	Murray
Biden	Grams	Nickles
Bingaman	Grassley	Reed
Bond	Gregg	Reid
Boxer	Hagel	Robb
Breaux	Harkin	Roberts
Brownback	Hatch	Rockefeller
Bryan	Helms	Roth
Burns	Hollings	Santorum
Byrd	Hutchinson	Sarbanes
Chafee, L.	Hutchison	Schumer
Cleland	Inouye	Sessions
Cochran	Johnson	Shelby
Collins	Kennedy	Smith (OR)
Conrad	Kerrey	Snowe
Craig	Kerry	Specter
Crapo	Kohl	Stevens
Daschle	Kyl	Thomas
DeWine	Landrieu	Thompson
Dodd	Lautenberg	Thurmond
Domenici	Leahy	Torricelli
Dorgan	Levin	Voinovich
Durbin	Lincoln	Warner
Edwards	Lott	Wellstone
Enzi	Lugar	Wyden
Feingold	Mack	

#### NAYS—5

Bunning	Inhofe	Smith (NH)
Campbell	Jeffords	

#### NOT VOTING—3

Akaka	Lieberman	Murkowski
-------	-----------	-----------

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I don't think we have reached an agreement on amendments yet. It is my intention to have some good, substantive debate on amendments. I have a number of amendments I want to bring to the floor. I certainly will agree to time limits on each of these amendments.

Mr. REID. If the Senator will yield, Senator MOYNIHAN has informed me that there has been an agreement reached between he and Senator ROTH and you, and that you would agree to 45 minutes on your side and they would agree to 20 minutes, with no second-degree amendments; is that right?

Mr. WELLSTONE. That is correct. It is not on paper yet, but I think that is what we will agree to.

Mr. REID. Can we agree to it right now?

Mr. WELLSTONE. No. There are a few things to be worked out first.

Mr. REID. I thank the Senator.

AMENDMENT NO. 4114

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE], for himself and Mr. HELMS, proposes an amendment numbered 4114.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require the President to certify to Congress that the People's Republic of China has taken certain actions with respect to ensuring religious freedom, as recommended by the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom)

On page 4, line 22, beginning with "Prior", strike all through page 5, line 6, and insert the following:

Prior to making the determination provided for in subsection (a)(1), the President shall transmit a report to Congress certifying that—

(1) pursuant to the provisions of section 122 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3532), the terms and conditions for the accession of the People's Republic of China to the World Trade Organization are at least equivalent to those agreed between the United States and the People's Republic of China on November 15, 1999; and

(2) following the recommendations of the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, the People's Republic of China has made substantial improvements in respect for religious freedom, as measured by the fact that—

(A) the People's Republic of China has agreed to open a high-level and continuing dialogue with the United States on religious-freedom issues;

(B) the People's Republic of China has ratified the International Convention on Civil and Political Rights, which it has signed;

(C) the People's Republic of China has agreed to permit the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom and international human rights organizations unhindered access to religious leaders, including those imprisoned, detained, or under house arrest;

(D) the People's Republic of China has responded to inquiries regarding persons who are imprisoned, detained, or under house arrest for reasons of religion or belief, or whose whereabouts are not known, although they were last seen in the custody of Chinese authorities; and

(E) the People's Republic of China has released from prison all persons incarcerated because of their religion or beliefs.